



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

VOL. III.

NO. II.

I.—ON THE CULEX AND OTHER POEMS OF THE APPENDIX VERGILIANA.

The *Culex*, with the *Ciris Dirae Moretum Copa* and epigrams generally known as *Catalecta*, as well as the *Aetna* now usually ascribed to Lucilius, have recently been re-edited by Bährens in the second volume of his *Poetae Latini Minores*. This work marks a great advance on the Appendix Vergiliana of Ribbeck, published in 1867, and has suggested to me many new views on these poems, which, from their peculiarly intimate relation to those of Catullus, have at all times had an attraction for me much beyond their intrinsic merit. None of them have come down to us in a more corrupt state than the 'Gnat,' and it is therefore of some importance to record from time to time the readings of a Bodleian MS, Auct. F 1, 17, which here, as also in the *Dirae* (see Cambridge Journal of Philology, VIII 72), may be reckoned among the uninterpolated class, generally exhibiting a close resemblance to Bährens' B.

24-27.

Et tu cui meritis oritur fiducia cartis,
Octauī uenerande, meis adlabere coeptis
Sancte puer, tibi namque canit non pagina bellum
Triste Iouis ponitque canit non pagina bellum
Phlegra giganteo sparsa est quo sanguine tellus.

It is obvious that in 26 *canit non pagina bellum* has been erroneously repeated from the following verse. Ribbeck completed the lacuna by reading *tibi namque humilis conamine primo*, Bährens *tibi namque sonant mea carmina, quamquam*. Retaining

this in outline, I would change *sonant* to *merent*, which would repeat with emphasis the expression of 24 *cui meritis*, unnecessarily altered by B. to *cuius monitis*. The metaphor is natural enough to a Roman: the poem takes service under the banners of Octavius: *ponitque*, which has been altered to *Rhoetique*, *Rhoecique*, *Coeique*, *Cottique*, *Phorcique*, may after all be *Pontique*, for Poseidon took his part in the war with the Giants (Apollod. I 6, 2). I cannot agree with Ribbeck and Bährens in supposing the Octavius to whom the poem is addressed to be any one but the youth who became later Octavianus and Augustus; only so can the strong expressions *Octavi uenerande*, *Sancte puer*, which last occurs twice (26, 37), be adequately explained; this too gives a meaning to the elaborate invocation to Apollo, a god especially associated with the history of Augustus. It is not necessary to suppose the poem actually written to the young Octavius; for my own part I have never been able to regard it as anything but the composition of a later, but still early period, when the tradition that Virgil had written a *Culex* prompted some versifier to *supply* the required poem. Such a forger would naturally inscribe his *Culex* to Augustus, and as Virgil was supposed to have written it in boyhood, to Augustus still a boy. No one can, I suppose, read the verses eulogizing a country life (58 sqq.) and not feel certain that they are an imitation of the famous passage in Georg. II, *O fortunatos nimium*.

37, 8.

Haec tibi, sancte puer, memorabilis et tibi certet
 Gloria perpetuum lucens mansura per aeuum.
 Et tibi sede pia maneat locus, et tibi sospes
 Debita felicitis memoretur vita per annos
 Grata bonis lucens.

It is surprising that Bähr. retains *et* in 37. It is not only weak, but cacophonous in view of the double *et* in 39. I would read:

Haec tibi, sancte puer, *memorabimus*: *haec tibi restet*
 Gloria, etc.

And what can B. find so absurd in the words *Et tibi s. p. maneat locus?* which he alters to *Serum s. p. m. locus*. Surely the poet, whose gnat finally rests in Elysium, might reasonably enough wish his patron the same good fortune; *tibi* with *maneat* as in Cat. VIII 15; Phil. II 5, 11.

55.

O bona pastoris si quis non pauperis usum
 Mente prius docta fastidiat et probet illis
 Omnia luxuriae spretis incognita curis.

In my Catullus of 1867 I conjectured that *illi somnia* had been corrupted into *illis omnia*, and suggested that the error arose from the two verses having at some time been written *continuously*. Subsequently I found that Haupt had conjectured *somnia*, leaving *illis* unchanged. I still prefer my original explanation of the corruption and venture to think that most critics will consider *illi* more elegant, as it is certainly on other grounds more probable than *illis*. 'Happy the shepherd's lot, should there be any who scorns not the employment of the poor and commends the dreams that proud life of luxury never knew, despising the cares that torture the covetous.'

57.

Haec teneras fruticum sentes rimatur, at illa
 Inminet in riui praestantis imaginis undam.

Here *imaginis* is usually supposed to be a corruption of *marginis*, wrongly, I fancy; at least none of the emendations which it necessitates in the rest of the verse can be considered very probable. On the other hand the goat might well be described as hanging over the water to look at her own reflected image, like the horse in a well-known fragment of Sophocles (593). Hence I would read *praesentis imaginis undam*, an image-presenting stream. The double genitive, the latter of quality, is not harsher than the double abl. in 153. So Spenser in his translation, 'The whiles another high doth overlooke Her owne like image in a christall brooke.'

89, 90.

Illi dulcis adest requies et pura uoluptas
 Libera simplicibus curis.

Rather *duplicibus*.

101.

Tendit ineuctus radios Hyperionis ardor,
 Lucidaque aethereo ponit discrimina mundo.

This strange word *ineuctus*, which is supposed to recur in 342:

Ne quisquam propriae fortunae munere diues
 Iret ineuctus caelum super

seems to raise no doubts in lexicographers, who explain it as 'mounted upon.' We must then suppose that in the first passage the sun's heat is described as mounted on its rays, *tendit radios quibus ineuctus est*, and in the second that the rich man mounts on the chariot of his wealth above the sky. The first of these is undeniably harsh, and the word itself is spelt in Bährens' MS V in *eicectus*; while in 342 the Bodl. MS above alluded to (Mr. Macray, one of our best experts, dates it about 1230) gives *euectus*. In this passage indeed there are other signs of the traditional reading being wrong, for though the Bodl. MS (which I shall call F) like the others collated by Bähr. gives *Iret*, a Paris Anthology has *Tendit*, and it seems more than probable that *Tenderet euectus* is the right reading. But may not *ineuctus* in 101 be, as we should at first sight more readily believe (cf. *inexcitus*, *inexhaustus*, etc.), a negatival adj., 'not yet borne aloft,' *i. e.* to the highest part of the sky? We must then suppose the poet to mean that *up to that time of the day* the sun had not reached the zenith, and *now begins* to approach it and disperse his rays equally to both sides of the sky. This quite agrees with what immediately follows, 107 *Iam medias operum partis euectus erat sol*, which is a further step onwards, that part of the day when the sun had got *beyond* the zenith, at the hottest part of the afternoon. Still as V gives in *eicectus* and no authority is quoted but the *Culex* for *ineuctus*, it is possible that the right reading is *in erectum*, 'the sun stretches his rays in an upright line,' not slanting at an angle as at an earlier or later period of the day.

109.

Vt procul aspexit luco residere uirenti,
Delia diua, tuo, quo quondam uicta furore
Venit Nyctelium fugiens Cadmeis Agaue,
Infandas scelerata manus et caede cruenta.

157.

Pastor ut ad fontem densa requiescit in umbra,
Mitem concepit proiectus membra soporem.

Such I believe to be the real apodosis of *Vt procul*. With *quo quondam uicta furore* begins a description of the grove, which continues for more than 50 lines, and thus disguises the fact that the sentence began with a protasis and remains incomplete. The nominative is accordingly resumed in *Pastor ut*. This will enable us to dispense with the changes suggested by Ribbeck, Bährens and earlier editors. Nor can I think that any alteration is required

in 112, either Bembo's *e* or Ribbeck's very problematical *ec*: as abl. *cruenta* would be tautologous, as nom. 'gory with a deed of blood' it is Virgilian (Aen. I 475) and animated.

117.

Tantum non horridus Hebrum
Restantem tenuit ripis siluasque canendo
Quantum te per nigre morantem diua chorea
Multa tuo laetae fundentes gaudia uultu.

For *horridus* or *orridus* in 117 is ordinarily printed (as in Pithou's Collection, p. 6, ed. 1590, and even by Ribbeck and Bährens) *Orpheus*, which is found only in *one* of B.'s MSS (V) as a first-hand reading, and can scarcely be right, whether on metrical or palaeographical grounds. It is quoted indeed by L. Müller (de r. m. p. 268) as a trisyllabic nominative with *Orphëus* in Cul. 269; but this was before the MSS had been accurately collated; and in 269 *Orpheos* as a genitive is rightly restored by Ribbeck. The nearest approach I can find to *orridus* is *odrisis*, and we might then suppose the Odrysian *region* to be substituted for the Odrisian *bard*, which is a mild, almost tame license in the poet, if compared with the parallel description in Seneca's *Hercules Oetaeus*, 1043 sqq., where Athos breaks part of its crags away with the Centaurs on them to come and stand near Rhodope, while Orpheus sings. If this should seem too bold, I would suggest *Non tantum Oeagrius*. V. 119 was emended by Haupt *Quantum te, pernix, remorantur, diua, chorea*, and *pernix* is actually written in V. But here again, as in 117, I hold the truer reading to be that of the other MSS, including F, and would read *Quantum te pernice morantur, diua, chorea*, by which the awkwardness of *chorea* as nom. followed by the plural *laetae fundentes* is obviated.

123, 4.

Nam primum prona surgebant valle patentes
Aeriae platanos, inter quas impia lotos.

So F; B has *platane* with *us* written over *e* in a more modern hand; V and several other MSS give *platani*. I should here, against Ribbeck, incline to regard *platanos* as the less corrupted reading, and, with Bembo, restore the rare but not incredible form *platanus*, which Neue seems to accept, *Formenlehre* I 536.

127.

At quibus insigni curru proiectus equorum
Ambustus Phaethon luctu mutauerat artus
Heliades.

This is no place for styling Phaethon's chariot splendid; an obvious correction is *indigne*. So Ovid speaking of the Sun's anger at Phaethon's death says, M. II 400 *Saeuit enim natumque obiectat et inputat illis*.

131.

Posterius cui Demophoon aeterna reliquit
Perfidiam flamentandi mala perfide multis
Perfide Demophoon et nunc defende puellis.

Bährens is, I believe, right in reading *lamentanti*, as certainly wrong in his *i nunc defendeque vela*. It would be difficult to improve on Scaliger's *deflende*, which Ribbeck retains. 'Thou faithless Demophoon, to many a maiden faithless, aye still a memory to rouse their tears,' a pleasing and natural apostrophe to the oft-repeated story of Phyllis' betrayal.

137-9.

Hic magnum Argoae naui decus edita (so F with most MSS, adita V) pinus
Proceros (Proceras, MSS) †decorat (decoras, F) siluas hirsuta per artus.
Ac petit aeriis †contingere †montibus astra.

I can hardly think *decorat* right. Possibly *superat*. *Montibus* was corrected by Scaliger to *motibus*, a very weak word; by Heinsius to *frondibus*. Audacious as to some it will seem, I believe the right word is *morsibus*; for the successive growths by which the fir and pine are continually rising, a new apex marking the new growth, might not inaptly be described as so many *bites in the air*.

153.

Argutis et cuncta fremunt ardore cicadis.

Bährens, ingeniously, *a rore*. I doubt, however, whether the fact is so, and suggest *stridore*, the regular word for the peculiar sound of the cicada, Plin. XI 266 *alia murmur edere, ut apis, alia cum tractu stridorem, ut cicadas, receptum enim duobus sub pectore cauis spiritum, mobili occursante membrana intus, attritu eius sonore*.

166-8.

Obuia uibranti carpens grauis ore trilingui
Squamosos late torquebat motibus orbes.
†Tollebant aurae uenientis ad omnia uisust.

In *ad omnia* I think *abdomina* probably lurks. For *aurae* V has *arte*. Bährens reads *Tendebant acres venientis ad omnia*

uisus, which certainly gives a clearly defined picture of the restless eyes of the advancing snake; but seems to me, as Latin, a little strained; *tendebant* especially is hardly the right word, to say nothing of the fact that *omnia* several times marks a corruption, as in 217, 233, 242. Accepting *nisus* for *uisus* from Ribbeck I would read *Tollebant acres(?) venienti abdomina nisus*, the contortions of the snake in its progress cause the belly to be constantly lifted from the ground and exposed to view. Silius has *nisu se concitat acri* of a warrior, v. 235. Or can *aurae* conceal *caudae*? Haupt's *Pallebant aura uementis gramina uiri* is inexpressibly violent, and will, I should fancy, convince no one, a remark which extends to many of his alterations of the *Culex*, especially in reference to his introduction of elisions against the MSS and in violation of the laws observed by the poet. See Birt's careful examination, *Haliut*. p. 50.

In 177 *Saepius arripiens* should be retained, as a repeated darting at objects in the way would be natural in an enraged serpent; similarly *spiritibus rumpit fauces* is not to be changed into *spiritus erumpit f.* (Heinsius), the plural expresses the convulsive and continual motion of the hissing throat.

185, 6.

Qua diducta genas pandebant lumina gemmis
Hac senioris erat nature pupula telo
Icta leui.

Forbiger explains 'where the unclosed eyes laid open the lids to the pupil,' i. e. for the eye-ball to exert its function of seeing, supposing *gemma* to be another word for *pupula*. But no instance of such a meaning is quoted, and the resemblance of sound in *genas gemmis*, as well as the iteration *pupula* in 186 (Bährens alters this to *palpebra*), is suspicious. Possibly *pennis* 'to the gnat's wings,' i. e. to the approach of the whirring gnat. *Nature* is, of course, as Bothe saw, a mistake for *mature*, 'in time' to avoid the serpent's bite. I do not think *palpebra* is right; (1) it is not the MS reading; (2) the word seems only to occur in the plural and with the *e* long, *Lucr.* IV 952; (3) if the eyes are stated to have been *unclosed*, it was because the *eye-ball*, not the eye-lid, was stung by the gnat.

193-5.

Quam casus sociarit opem numenue deorum
Prodere sit dubium, ualuit sed uincere tali
Horrida squamosi uoluentia membra draconis.

It is not necessary to change *tali* (V) into *talis*. Here *tale* is 'such a thing,' 'so slight a thing,' as *omne* is used for 'everything.' F with two of B.'s MSS has *tales*, which perhaps points to *tale* (nom.) as what the poet wrote.

198-201.

Et quod erat tardus somni languore remoto
 †Nescius aspiciens timor obcaecaverat artus
 Hoc minus implicuit dira formidine mentem
 Quem postquam uidit caesum languescere sedit.

Bährens is perhaps right in transposing 201 before 198, for 198-200 seem to explain *sedit*; the shepherd having killed the snake, instead of moving away at once from the scene of danger, sat down with less appearance of dismay than might have been expected, (1) *et quod*, because he was still drowsy from the sleep from which he had been suddenly awoke (*remoto*); (2) because the sudden alarm of the sight of the serpent had for a while paralyzed his limbs and made him unwilling to move. Hence for *Nescius* I would read *Nec secus*. Bährens' *Quo plus* seems to me too remote for the MSS, nor can I think his *astringens* for *aspiciens* probable. F has *tonor* for *timor*; but though Quintilian (I 5, 23) says *tonor* was an old form of *tenor* in the sense of accent, it can hardly mean anything like rigor or tension of the limbs, and must therefore, I think, be dismissed. There is, however, some weakness in *timor*, *formidine* in two consecutive lines. If *aspiciens timor* is thought, as perhaps it may be, too harsh, 'and similarly fear at the sight of the snake,' it would be easy to read *ad speciem*.

225-7.

Praemia sunt pietatis ubi, pietatis honores?
 In uanas abiire uices tet iure recessit
 Iustitiae prior illa fides.

For *et iure*, the reading of F and most MSS, V has *uita*, whence Bährens reads *et uicta recessit Iustitia et* (Schrader) *prior illa fides*. Is not *et* here somewhat weak? If V represents the true tradition, I should prefer *euicta*, 'driven out of its holdings, dispossessed'; if the other MSS, perhaps *abiire*, a repetition corresponding to that of *pietatis* in 225.

239 sqq.

Terreor a tantis insistere, terreor, umbris.
 Ad Stygias reuocatus aquas uix ultimus amni
 Restat nectareas diuum qui prodidit escas

Gutturis arenti reuolutus in omnia sensu.
 Qui saxum procul aduerso qui monte reuoluit
 Contempsisse dolor quem numina uincit acerbas
 Otia querentem frustra sibilite puelle
 Ite quibus tedas accendit tristis Erinis
 Sicut himen prelata dedit conubia mortis.

In this difficult passage the poet recalls himself to the description of the infernal world: 'I shudder to dwell on such grim shadows, to return to the waters of Styx.' Hence *Ad St. reuocatus aquas* should be constructed with *terreor*, not with *extat*. At *uix* begins the description of Tantalus' punishment. *Extat* for *Restat* (Heinsius) is certain, which cannot be said of any emendation yet proposed for *reuolutus in omnia*. We saw above that *omnia* is a frequent residue of error; in 217 it seems to represent *moenia* (Sillig); in 233 *Quem circa tristes densentur in omnia* (in *omnua* F) *Poenae*, it is, I believe, a mistake for *ostia*, as the *Poenae* would naturally gather at the door of Hell; in the line before us Ribbeck may be right in conjecturing *inania*, and if so, *reuolutus* (which can hardly stand with *reuoluit* in the next line) may be a mistake for *releuatus*, a word peculiarly appropriate to relief of hunger or thirst. Or is it possible that *in omnia* is here for *insomnia*? then *resolutus* may represent some active participle, *reparans*, *renouans* or the like. The next five verses I would write as follows:

Quid saxum procul aduerso qui monte reuoluit,
 Contempsisse dolor quem numina vincit acerbans,
 Otia quaerentem frustra *tribus*? Ite puellae,
 Ite quibus taedas accendens tristis Erinys,
 Sicut Hymen, praefata dedit conubia mortis.

The reference is to Sisyphus and the Danaides. *Acerbans* is, I imagine, better than *acerbus* or *acerba*, and here again I find the Bodl. MS a reliable guide; *acerbas* is another instance of the suppressed *n* of the nomin. participle of which Corssen collects so many instances. *Frustratibus* is rare, but occurs in Plautus; it might aptly enough express the baffled attempts of Sisyphus to roll the stone to the top of the mountain. The allusion in the last two verses is to the deadly bridal of the Danaides, 'to whom the Fury, speaking the words of prelude, as it were Hymen (Cat. LXIV 382), assigned a bridal that was death.'

265, 6.

Ecce Ithaci coniunx semper decus Icariotis
 Feminum concepta decus manet.

Decus in 265 is generally altered to *ducis*, in consequence of *decus* in 266. But it is not certain that this is the right word there, for F has what looks like *recus*. May not this represent *secus*, sex? With this Bährens' *consaepta* would well agree.

274. 5.

Ecfossasque (Necfossasque MSS) domos ac tartara nocte cruenta
Obsita, nec faciles ditis sine iudice sedes.

Ecfossas, not *Defossas*, is what MSS point to, 'homes dug out of the earth,' *i. e.* subterranean and dark. The form *ecfodere* is indubitable in Tacitus and Cicero as well as Plautus, as Lewis and Short show from Neue Formenl. II 767. *Dictaeo* (Bährens) is very plausible, yet *sine* must, I think, be genuine; perhaps, therefore, *Dictae sine* is what the poet wrote. There is too strong a tendency in editors to eliminate difficult negatives or words implying a negative. Thus in Heroid. XII 169, 170, Medea says *Non mihi grata dies, noctes uigilantur amarae, Nec tener a misero pectore somnus abit*, for so I would modify A. Palmer's conjecture, following the MSS, which would hardly have changed *Nec* into *Et*. *Nec* qualifies *tener*, 'and sleep, not the soft sleep of a happy lover, flies from me.' So in the passage of the *Culex* before us, *nec* extends both to *faciles* and *sine iudice*, 'and the abodes that smile not with Dictae's judge away,' *i. e.* 'the abodes where Dictae's judge is ever present to make them forbidding.' Cf. the remarks of Birt, Halieut. p. 49.

286-288.

Haec eadem potuit Ditis te uincere coniunx
Eurudicenque ultro ducendam reddere : non fas
Non erat inuitam dire exorabile mortis.

'This same lyre had power to persuade thee, consort of Pluto, and to restore Eurydice unasked to be led away. But it might not be; to traverse the path of dreadful death was not to be won by entreaty.' I read then¹ *ire uiam*. F, both here and in 268, has *Erudice*, in which I trace a vestige of the old spelling *Eurudice*.

294.

Dignus amor venia tgratiam si Tartara nossent.

So F, *gratum* most MSS, as I incline to think, rightly. 'Gratitude,' viz. for Orpheus' devotion. Birt reads *gratam*, explaining of Proserpine, Halieut. p. 53.

¹ Birt, *Non fas, Non erat : Inuictae diuiae exorabile numen*. Halieut. p. 53.

295-303.

Peccatum meminisse graves tuos sede piorum
 Vos manet heroum contra manus, hic et uterque
 Aeacides, Peleus namque et Telamonia virtus
 Per secura patris laetantur numina, quorum
 Conubiis uenus et uirtus iniunxit honorem.
 Hunc rapuit ferit ast illum nereis amavit.
 Adsidet hac iuuenis sociat de gloria sortis
 Alter in excissum referens a navibus ignis
 Argolicis Phrygios turba feritate repulsos.

No passage of the *Culex* is more corrupt than this. I will give what appears to me the connexion of thought. 'Yet it were shame to remember Orpheus' sin: ye are both (Orpheus and Eurydice) destined to rest in Elysium with the heroes of old time. In Elysium are both the Aeacids Peleus and Telamon, rejoicing in the tranquil assurance of their father's divine power (Apollod. III 12, 15 τιμάται δὲ καὶ παρὰ Πλούτωνι τελευτήσας Αἰακὸς καὶ τὰς κλείς τοῦ "Αϊδου φυλάττει), and in life raised by their prowess and the love they inspired to marriages of high consideration. Seated near is Ajax, associated with them by the allotment of destiny—Ajax of boldness unapproachable, telling how the Trojans were beaten back in confusion from the Greek ships which they would fain have set on fire.' The whole passage I would write thus:

Peccatum meminisse gravest (Bähr.): uos sede piorum
 Vos manet heroum contra manus. Hic et uterque
 Aeacides: Peleus namque et Telamonia virtus
 Per secura patris laetantur numina, quorum
 Conubiis uenus et uirtus iniunxit honorem.
 Hunc rapit *Hesiona*, ast illum Nereis amauit.
 Adsidet huic invenis, sociat *quem* (Bähr.) gloria sortis,
 Acer (Bemb.) inaccessum, referens a nauibus ignis
 Argolicis Phrygios turba *trepidante* repulsos.

The most doubtful point in these verses is the obviously corrupt *feritast* (*feritas* V) and again *feritate* (303). It is remarkable that *feritatis* recurs in 311 where it is undoubtedly right; but it cannot but be wrong I think in each of the former places. Bembo conjectured in 300 *serua ast*, Schrader *Periboea*, which Ribbeck and Bährens adopt. I greatly doubt the possibility of *periboea* becoming *feritas*; *ast* is thoroughly in its place in a contrast of this kind; in some forms of writing, *Hesionast* might easily be misread *feritast*; while to supply an exact parallel might be quoted Ovid M.

215 sqq. *Nec pars militiae Telamon sine honore recessit, Hesione que data potitur. Nam coniuge Peleus Clarus erat diua.* In the next verse Bährens seems right in recalling *quem* of H for *de* of F and most MSS, but I see no reason for changing *sortis* to *sorti*. For *in excisum* (*excidium* H, *excelsum* V) which Bähr. alters to *in excessum*, with very dubious meaning, I would write *inaccessum*, a rare word which easily became obscured; *turba* seems to be right, as Homer speaks of the confused scene which ensued when the Trojans were driven back from the attack on the ships, Il. XVI 294:

Ἡμιδαῖς δ' ἄρα νηὺς λίπετ' αὐτόθι· τοὶ δ' ἐφόβηθεν
 Τρῶες θεσπεσίῳ ὁμάδῳ. Δαναοὶ δ' ἐπέχυντο
 Νῆας ἀνὰ γλαφυράς· ὄμαδος δ' ἀλίσστος ἐτύχθη.

And again, 367 :

ᾧς τῶν ἐκ νηῶν γέμετο ἰαχὴ τε φόβος τε,
 Οὐδὲ κατὰ μοῖραν πέραον πάλιν.

Besides, *torua feritate* is feeble, and everything points to the corruption lying not in *turba*, but *feritate*, for which V has *feritare*, H *fremitante*. What word these variants conceal is of course doubtful; *trepidante* is tolerably near and gives excellent sense.

304.

O quis non referat talis diuortia belli ?

Diuortia is perhaps a translation of the Homeric πολέμοιο γεφύρας.

311, 312.

Ipsa uagis namque Ida potens feritatis et ipsa
 Ida faces altrix cupidis praebebat alumnis,
 Omnis ut in cineres Rhoetei litoris ora
 Classibus ambustis flamma lacrimante daretur.

Bembo wrote *iugis* for *uagis*, which Heinsius completed by writing *frondentibus* for *feritatis et*. But (1) the repetition of the two words *ipsa Ida* might well be accompanied by a connecting *et*; (2) *potens* or *patens* is an obvious corruption of *parens* which, retaining *feritatis*, will then be a translation of the Homeric μήτηρ θηρῶν. Hence *uagis* (*uatis* H) must conceal some accusative, possibly *trabes*, the material of spears. If *flamma lacrimante* is right, it can only mean an oozy flame such as is produced by pitch and similar resinous substances. My friend Mr. Shadworth Hodgson suggests *lambente*. In the difficult passage which follows this the word *Tegminibus*

can, I think, hardly represent *Ignibus hic*, but either *Fragminibus* or perhaps *Hic manibus*; for this last cf. Il. XV 716 "Εκτωρ δὲ πρύμνηθεν ἐπεὶ λάβεν, οὐχὶ μεθείει" Ἀφλαστον μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχων.

325, 6.

Rursus acerba fremunt Paris hunc quod letat et huius
Arma dolis Ithaci virtus quod concidit icta.

Arma surely cannot be *Alma*, for who would think of applying such an epithet to the valor of Ajax? Bährens suggests that *Arma* is a relic of two lost verses, in which the adjudication of the arms of Achilles to Ulysses and the subsequent death of Ajax were narrated. F omits the words after *uirtus*.

327-330.

Huic gerit auersos proles Laertia uultus
Et iam Strymonii Rhesi victorque Dolonis
Pallade fiam laetatur ouans, rursusque tremiscit
Iam Ciconas iamque horret [atrox Laestrygonas ipse].

It is inconceivable that *iam* should be repeated four times so meaninglessly. Read *Pallade laetabatur ouans*, and cf. 50 sqq. *tondebant, carpuntur, petuntur*. The words after *horret* are omitted in F; so in 334 it omits *Atrides* after *gener amplis* (*sic*); in 340 it has only one word, *Neque*; in 362 it omits *moritura metelli*.

363, 4.

Curtius et mediis quem quondam sedibus urbis
Deutum bellis consumpsit gurgitis unda.

For *bellis* a not improbable emendation is *uiolens*.

370, 1.

Scipiadaeque duces, quorum deuota triumphis
Moenia trapidis Libycae Carthaginiis horrent.

H gives *iapidis*. This suggests *lappis*, the burs or weeds which spring up on neglected sites, Virg. G. I 152. Haupt's *uepretis* conveys the same idea, but is farther from the MSS. *Sub* seems to have fallen out.

374, 5.

Et uastum Phlegethonta pati, quo, maxime Minos,
Conscelerata pia discernis uincula sede.

'Phlegethon by which Minos separates the prison of the guilty from the abode of the blest.' I cannot see that *vincula* requires any change against all MSS.

399.

Et rosa purpureum crescent rubibunda terrorem.

So B; F has *quiescant rubicunda*; V *pudibunda*; H gives *tenorem*; C *per orbem*. The old reading *crescens* is to my mind made probable by the peculiar form it assumes in F; the whole line I would read

Et rosa purpureum crescens pudibunda per orbem,

'growing in the folds of a crimson disk.' *Per* denotes the gradual accretion of the petals into the full flower.

Dirae 83.

Tuque inimica tui semper discordia eiuis.

Bährens rightly calls *tui* meaningless; but *boni* is not so probable a restoration as *pui*. In Prop. III 13, 56 *hospitio non, Polydore, pio* most of the MSS have *tuo*; and in II 25, 31 *Namque in amore suo semper sua maxima cuique Nescio quo pacto uerba nocere solent*, the meaning is in favor of *pui*, a *faithful* love, as opposed to a wandering and shifting passion.

91, 3.

Tardius a miserae descendite monte capellae.

Mollia non iterum carpetis pabula nota.

Tuque resiste pater, fea prima nouissima uobis.

The general sense is clear; the she-goats and their male leader are leaving forever their browsing-ground. They are therefore told to linger and *crop their last meal*. Possibly then we should read *ea thymbra nouissima uobis*, 'that is the last meal of savory you will ever see,' or *cyma*, 'the last sprout.'

Lydia 14.

Membra reclinarit teneremque illiserit herbam.

The Bodleian MS like most of Bährens' has *tenerem* (not *teneram*); H *veneri*. Hence I would read *temere atque*.

R. ELLIS.